

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the present application. In summary, the Examiner maintains the same rejections of claims 1-4 and 6 as set forth in the previous Office Action. The Examiner adds a new reference to support the rejection of claim 5. Specifically, claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Woo (US Patent No. 6,681,125) in view of Aoto (US Patent No. 6,615,055). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Woo in view of Aoto and further in view of Naoe (JP 02000124732).

**§103(a) Rejections (Woo / Aoto) - Claims 1-4 and 6**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 and 6 for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action, and adds a few new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Office Action. Applicants traverse these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants previously argued that neither Woo nor Aoto, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggest that, “in a state where the first and the second chassis are opened, the whip antenna is pulled out in a direction of approaching a back surface side of the first chassis and is held,” as recited in claim 1. *See second full paragraph on page 2 of Response dated October 7, 2005.* In response, the Examiner alleges:

Aoto teaches an antenna can be pulled out in any direction. Those skilled in the art thus would appreciated that Aoto’s antenna can be pulled out in a direction approaching a back surface side of a first chassis and/or in a direction inclined by a specified angle from a vertical direction.

In response, Applicants maintain that even if, *arguendo*, the antenna of Aoto can be pulled in any direction with respect to an inclination, it does not inherently, or necessarily, follow that the antenna will be pulled out in a direction approaching a back surface side of a first chassis. Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Aoto that the antenna would be held. At least based on these arguments, Applicants maintain that the applied references do not disclose or suggest the features set forth in claim 1.

Further, Applicants maintain that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to combine Aoto and Woo at least based on the reasons set forth in the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the previously filed Response. Also, in the previous Response, Applicants argued that the primary reference Woo teaches away from that which is disclosed in Aoto. *See first full paragraph on page 3 of previous Response.* The Examiner does not even respond to these particular arguments. At least based on these reasons, Applicants maintain that the applied references do not render the present invention, as recited in claim 1, obvious.

Applicants maintain that dependent claims 2-4 and 6 are patentable at least by virtue of their indirect or direct dependency from independent claim 1.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 2, in the present Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the teaching of Woo inherently teaches that the whip antenna is flexible and it is formed into a curved shape due to the gravitational force or a vibration. According to Applicants review of Woo and the pictures therein, there is not an antenna with a curved shape. Therefore, Applicants maintain the applied references do not satisfy the features set forth in claim 2.

With respect to claim 3, the Examiner cites the same portions used to support the rejection of claim 1, and alleges that since Aoto's antenna can be pulled in any direction with

respect to any inclination, the teaching of Aoto inherently teaches the claimed invention as set forth in claim 3. In response, Applicants maintain that the Examiner has yet again utilized impermissible hindsight reasoning, as nowhere does Aoto disclose or suggest that a tip of the whip antenna comes in contact with the back surface of the first chassis in the middle of an open operation of the first and second chassis. Yet further, nowhere does Aoto or Woo, either alone or in combination, disclose that the whip antenna is extended while the tip slides on a back surface of the first chassis.

Finally, with respect to dependent claim 6, Applicants maintain that nowhere does Aoto or Woo discuss or suggest at least the specific feature of pulling out a whip antenna in a direction inclined by a specified angle from a vertical direction. That is, there is no specific angle of inclination mentioned with respect to the antennas in the two applied references.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicants maintain that claims 1-4 and 6 are patentably distinguishable over Woo and Aoto, either alone or in combination.

**§103(a) Rejections (Woo / Aoto / Naoe) - Claim 5**

Applicants submit that claim 5 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1. Naoe does not make up for the deficiencies of the other applied references.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
**U. S. Application No. 10/517,365**

**ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q84976**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 22, 2006